

REMARKS

I. Preliminary Remarks

A. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for issuing the interview summary mailed July 11, 2008, clarifying the office action and providing a listing of claims directed to allowable subject matter (i.e., claims 47 and 48, if rewritten in independent format, and claims 50, 53, 61-63, 67-70, 72-75 and 77-96). In a telephone call with the undersigned on July 23, 2008, Examiner Dang confirmed that the claims indicated as being “free of the art” on the interview summary (i.e., claims 50, 53, 61-63, 67-70, 72-75 and 77-96) are indeed directed to allowable subject matter.

B. Explanation of Amendments to the Claims

Claims 46, 67, 97 and 98 are amended and claims 43, 44, 47, 49, 54-60, 65-66, 71 and 76 are canceled herein. Claim 46 have been amended to include the subject matter of claim 47, which the Examiner has indicated in the interview summary as being directed to allowable subject matter. Claim 67 has been rewritten in independent form. Claims 97 and 98 have been amended to delete references to canceled claims. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by the amendments to claims 46, 67, 97 and 98.

The amendments to or cancellation of claims presented herein are made solely to expedite issuance and not for reasons pertaining to patentability. Applicants maintain all previous arguments and do not intend by these or any other amendments to abandon the subject matter of any claim as originally filed, and reserve the right to pursue such subject matter in this or related applications, including but not limited to parent and continuing applications.

II. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, are moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 65-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description and enablement requirements. The rejections are moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

III. The obviousness-type double patenting rejections are moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 43, 44, 46, 49, 51, 52, 54-60, 61, 64, 71 and 76 as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-5 and 14-49 of U.S. Patent No. 6,824,777. The rejection of claims 43, 44, 49, 54-60, 71 and 76 is moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

Claim 46 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 47, which the Examiner has already indicated as being allowable. See Section I above.

The Examiner confirmed in a telephone call with the undersigned on July 23, 2008, that independent claims 50, 61 and 62 are also directed to allowable subject matter. Thus, claims that depend from any of these allowed claims are also directed to allowable subject matter (i.e., claims 51, 52, and 62-64).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the double-patenting rejections are moot and should be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. This amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance, and the Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned agent or attorney David A. Gass, if any questions or remaining issues arise that might be resolved by telephone.

Dated: August 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Jeanne M. Brashear/56,301

Jeanne M. Brashear

Registration No.: 56,301

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Agent for Applicants